

REMARKS

In the July 19, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-6 were pending in the application and rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Gunjima et al. (Reference A in the December 8, 2003 Office Action). This rejection was identical to the rejection in the November 3, 2004 and December 8, 2003 Office Actions, except for the next-to-last sentence on page 2. The independent claims have been amended to recite "that a maximum-intensity-direction of polarization involved by light emitted from said light guide plate is rotated around a traveling direction of the light toward a direction of a light transmission axis of said polarization plate by transmitting through the light control sheet" (e.g., claim 1, last 3 lines, new words underlined). As a result, it is submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over Gunjima et al. for the reasons discussed below.

In rejecting the claims, prism array 7 which causes reflection of light as illustrated in Fig. 1 and described at column 12, lines 31-45, was cited as disclosing the light control sheet recited in the independent claims. However, there is no suggestion in the cited portion or anywhere else in Gunjima et al. that prism array 7 has any role in the polarization of the light emitted therefrom. As clearly apparent from the symbols defined in the legend at the bottom of Fig. 1 and the description of polarized light separator 6 in column 11, lines 9-49, polarized light separator 6 causes light having a "polarization face perpendicular to plane" to be reflected within light guide 3 and permits light with an "in-plane polarization face" to pass through polarized light separator 6 and reach prism array 7. There is no subsequent mention of any effect on the polarization of the light by either prism array 7 or light diffusing sheet 8. Nor is there any suggestion that polarized light separator 6 has any effect on the polarization of the light passing therethrough. It merely acts as a polarized light filter, like that well known to anyone who has used polarized sunglasses.

On the other hand, as noted above the independent claims recite that the characteristics of the material from which the light control sheet is made causes the "maximum-intensity-direction of polarization ... [of] light emitted from said light guide plate ... [to be] rotated around a traveling direction of the light toward a direction of a light transmission axis of said polarization plate by transmitting through the light control sheet" (e.g., claim 1, last three lines). Thus, according to the invention the direction of polarization of light is affected by passing through the light guide plate. All that occurs in prism array 7 of the device taught by Gunjima et al. is **redirection** of the light whose polarization is a result of the filtering effect of polarized light separator 6.

Claims 2 and 3 recite the same limitations quoted above from claim 1 and therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-3 and claims 4-6 which depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Gunjima et al. for the above reasons.

Summary

It is submitted that Gunjima et al. does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-6 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/19/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501